



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

v. Milligan, 75 Mo. 41. And if it is so recorded it should have the same retroactive effect. But in the principal case A's mortgage was not recorded within a reasonable time. *Wilson v. Milligan*, *supra*. In such circumstances it has been held that an intervening creditor who takes a mortgage without notice will be protected although the prior mortgage is recorded first. *Bank of Farmington v. Ellis*, 30 Minn. 270. *Cf. Crooks v. Stuart*, 2 McCrary 13. It is submitted that this view is more equitable and more in accord with the purpose of the statute than the holding in the principal case, and it would seem that the delivery of possession to A should not affect the decision; for there is no authority for giving delivery an effect different from that of recording.

CONFLICT OF LAWS — MARRIAGE — VALIDITY OF FOREIGN MARRIAGE. — A Wisconsin statute prohibited remarriage by a divorcee within a year after the decree rendered, and declared that a marriage so contracted would be held null and void. To evade this statute the plaintiff and decedent were married in Michigan within a year after the latter had obtained a divorce. *Held*, that the marriage is void. *Lanham v. Lanham*, 117 N. W. 787 (Wis.).

That the validity of a marriage is determined by the *lex loci contractus* is the general rule in this country. *State v. Richardson*, 72 Vt. 49. But it is within the power of a state to declare by statute that certain marriages will not be recognized. *Pennegar v. State*, 87 Tenn. 244. And when a marriage valid where celebrated comes within the terms of such a statute, the question to be determined is one of legislative intent. *State v. Kennedy*, 76 N. C. 251. In this determination the courts refuse to construe a statute literally unless it reflects a state public policy. See *Van Voorhis v. Brintnall*, 86 N. Y. 18. And by the weight of authority no such policy is involved in statutes dealing with the remarriage of divorced persons. *Commonwealth v. Lane*, 113 Mass. 458. *Cf. McLennan v. McLennan*, 31 Ore. 480. Thus, the statute is held to apply only to marriages celebrated within the state. *Willey v. Willey*, 22 Wash. 115. In many states, however, such judicial legislation is not upheld, and the evasion of the law sought to be effected by temporary resort to a foreign jurisdiction, is not allowed. *Kruger v. Kruger*, 36 Nat. Corp. Rep. 442 (Ill., May, 1908); *Stull's Estate*, 183 Pa. 625. On principle these decisions are sound, but their effect upon the rights of innocent parties is deplorable. See *Commonwealth v. Lane*, *supra*.

CONFLICT OF LAWS — RECOGNITION OF FOREIGN PENAL LAWS — ASSESSMENTS. — An action was brought in England by an Australian municipality to recover a sum levied by it for street improvements. An Australian statute gave a right of action for such assessments. *Held*, that the action does not lie. *Sydney Municipal Council v. Cook*, 25 T. L. R. 6 (Eng., K. B. D., Oct. 15, 1908). See NOTES, p. 292.

CONTRACTS — DIVISIBLE CONTRACTS — PART PERFORMANCE OF INDIVISIBLE CONTRACT. — The plaintiff under an entire contract had furnished labor and material in installing a heating plant in the defendant's building, which was destroyed before the work was completed. The units of the plant had become part of the defendant's land when put in place. *Held*, that the defendant must pay in terms of the contract, irrespective of the benefit he has derived. *Dame v. Wood*, 70 Atl. 1081 (N. H.).

The general rule is that, when a party has contracted to do an entire work for a specific sum, he cannot recover unless the work be done. *Appleby v. Myers*, L. R. 2 C. P. 651. Relief is usually given quasi-contractually, however, to prevent the unjust enrichment of the defendant. *Britton v. Turner*, 6 N. H. 481. But a recovery for part performance such as was allowed in the present case is directly opposed to all the English decisions on the subject. See *Appleby v. Myers*, *supra*. It is analogous to the American rule that gives a servant employed on an entire contract, who is discharged for cause, a right to recover in terms of the contract. *Hildebrand v. Am. Fine Art Co.*, 109 Wis. 171. But that extension of the general rule is unsound in principle. See *Tim-*